



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,987	08/20/2003	Marybeth Ahern	00240293US	5154
7590 11/26/2008				
Andrew M. Calderon Greenblum and Bernstein P.L.C. 1950 Roland Clarke Place Reston, VA 20191				
EXAMINER KARDOS, NEIL R				
ART UNIT 3623		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 11/26/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/643,987

Applicant(s)

AHERN ET AL.

Examiner

Neil R. Kardos

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 32-41 and 52-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 32-41 and 52-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a **NON-FINAL** Office action on the merits in response to the request for continued examination filed on October 9, 2008. Claims 1, 32, and 52 have been amended. Claims 57 and 58 have been added. Currently, claims 1-8, 10, 32-41, and 52-58 are pending and have been examined.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 9, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant argues the following:

(A) Neither Ann nor Pisello partition information relevant to enterprise decision making for evolutionary change by creating categories of the information and relating these categories to one another and automating the management of the categories of the information by an automation system, the information being defined by at least one of the value, the at least one capability, and operational resources (see Remarks, page 11).

4. Regarding argument (A), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Regarding the first limitation (“partitioning”), Applicant asserts that Ann does not “partition” information (see Remarks, page 12, ¶ 1). However, the claim recites that information is partitioned *by creating categories of the information and relating these categories to one another*. Figure 5 of Ann clearly shows categories of information (e.g. strategic directions, capabilities, principles, processes, roles, responsibilities, organization units, resources, etc.). Figure 5 also shows relating these categories by depicting the relationship between categories with arrows. Thus, Ann clearly shows “creating categories of information and relating these categories to one another.” By disclosing this limitation, Ann necessarily discloses the claimed “partitioning” of information. Examiner also asserts that the newly introduced prior art reference, Patankar, also discloses partitioning information (see at least page 21, “Introduction”, ¶ 2, *enterprise integration as a way to integrate a variety of information*; page 22, “Definition of an enterprise model”, ¶ 2, *The model should contain business rules and definitions of the properties of all constituent parts. The rules and definitions can be used to integrate unrelated parts into an integrated whole.*). Furthermore, Examiner asserts that relating categories of partitioned information is inherent, or at least obvious, in an enterprise architecture. The MIT Center for Information Systems Research defines Enterprise Architecture as “the organizing logic for business processes and IT infrastructure reflecting the integration and standardization requirements of the firm’s operating model.” Examiner asserts that this limitation (1) is disclosed by Ann, (2) is disclosed by Patankar, and (3) is obvious in view of what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art.

5. Regarding the second limitation (“automating”), Applicant asserts that Ann does not automate the management of the categories (see Remarks, page 12, ¶ 2). In paragraph 32, Ann discloses governance rules that govern architecture framework management. Governance rules are set up to automatically determine the impact that a change in one category has on other categories (see abstract). Examiner also asserts that the newly introduced prior art reference, Patankar, also discloses automating the management of categories (see page 22, “Definition of an enterprise model”, ¶ 2, disclosing business rules and definitions that can be used to integrate unrelated parts into an integrated whole; page 22, “Definition of enterprise integration”, ¶ 1, *without asking*; page 23, “Motivation for EIM”, ¶ 1, disclosing the integration of hardware, applications, and business functions; page 23, “Performance monitoring and prediction”, disclosing predictive models; page 23, “Management by systems”; page 24, “CIM reference models”, disclosing automation systems; page 25, “Business process modeling”, ¶ 3, disclosing a database that stores organizational structure and activities and a rule interpreter that uses the database to assist in processing). Furthermore, Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well-known in the art at the time the invention was made to automate processes. *See in re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958). Also, it was well-known in the art to employ computers to aid in decision-making based on enterprise architectures. Examiner asserts that this limitation (1) is suggested by Ann, (2) is disclosed by Patankar, and (3) is obvious in view of what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art.

6. (B) Neither Ann nor Pisello use one or more external process modeling tools to determine a performance associated with the enterprise architecture, wherein the one or more external process modeling tools are configured to capture one or more process measurements and link the one or more process measurements to a database.

7. Argument (B) has been considered but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, found below. The new grounds of rejection is necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

Response to Amendment

8. Applicant's amendments to claims 1, 32, and 52, as well as the addition of claims 57 and 58, have been acknowledged. New prior art rejections addressing these changes can be found below.

Claim Objections

9. **Claim 58 is objected to because of the following informalities:**

Claim 58: Examiner believes that claim 58 contains a typographical error. The claim reads in part: "using the assigned weight to make a decision on one ore more of the implementation cost, the revenue increase, and the cost saving." Examiner believes that the word "based" was inadvertently omitted from the claim, and that it should read: "using the assigned weight to make a decision based on...." This reading of the claim is supported on page 15, paragraph 48 of Applicant's originally filed specification (or alternatively, paragraph 92 of the pre-grant publication). Further, the claim does not make sense as currently written.

Therefore, Examiner interprets the claim to mean using the assigned weight to make a decision based on one or more of the implementation cost, the revenue increase, and the cost saving.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

10. Claims 1-8, 10, and 53-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1: Claim 1 is directed toward the statutory category of a process. In order for a claimed process to be patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101, it must either: (1) be tied to another statutory class of invention (such as a particular apparatus), or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. *See Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972). If neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method/process is not patentable subject matter under § 101. Thus, to qualify as a statutory process under § 101, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class to which it is tied (e.g. by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps), or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed (e.g. by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state). Nominal recitations of structure in an otherwise ineligible method fail to make the method a statutory process. *See Benson*, 409 U.S. at 71-72. Thus, incidental physical limitations, such as gathering/inputting/outputting data, pre- or post-solution activity,

and field of use limitations are not sufficient to convert an otherwise ineligible process into a statutory one.

Here, the claimed process fails to meet the above requirements for patentability under § 101 because it is not tied to another statutory category and does not transform underlying subject matter. Although the claim recites an “automation system” and a “database,” these elements do not necessarily constitute a particular apparatus. In other words, they could constitute software, which is not recognized as a statutory category under § 101.

Claims 2-8, 10, and 53-58: Dependent claims 2-8, 10, and 53-58 are rejected for failing to remedy the deficiencies of the claims from which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. **Claims 1-8, 10, 32-41, and 52-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ann (US 2002/0198727) in view of Pisello (US 2003/0158800), and further in view of Patankar, “Enterprise Integration Modelling: A Review of Theory and Practice.”**

Claim 1: Ann discloses a method for managing and tracking changes, the method comprising the steps of:

- defining at least one customer requirement for an enhancement to an enterprise architecture (see figure 5, disclosing strategic directions 302; ¶ 9, disclosing business requirements and objectives; ¶¶ 34 and 37);
- identifying at least one capability to provide the enhancement to the enterprise architecture (see figure 5, disclosing capabilities 304 supporting strategic directions 302; ¶¶ 13, 27, 36, 41, and 43, disclosing capabilities); and
- partitioning information relevant to enterprise decision making for evolutionary change by creating categories of the information and relating these categories to one another (see e.g. figure 5, depicting categories and their relationships) and automating the management of the categories of the information by an automation system (see e.g. ¶ 29, disclosing storing the categories and relationships in a computer; see also Response to Arguments, above), the information being defined by at least one of the value, the at least one capability (see figure 5, capabilities 304), and operational resources (see figure 5, organization units 312, roles & responsibilities 314, processes 316; ¶ 33; see also Response to Arguments, above).

Ann does not explicitly disclose:

- estimating at least one of a revenue increase and a cost saving associated with the at least one capability;
- determining a value provided by the at least one capability based upon an implementation cost and the at least one of the revenue increase and the cost saving

However, Ann does disclose analyzing the impact of proposed enterprise changes prior to implementation (see ¶¶ 6, 14, and 47).

Pisello teaches estimating at least one of a revenue increase and a cost saving associated with a potential IT project to support organizational goals (see ¶¶ 39 and 43, disclosing cost savings associated with the IT project). Pisello also teaches determining a value provided by the IT project based on implementation cost and at least one of the revenue increase and the cost saving (see ¶ 33, disclosing determining IT costs; ¶¶ 39 and 43, disclosing cost savings; ¶ 40, disclosing a cost-benefit template; ¶¶ 51-56 disclosing cost-benefit indices for the projects; ¶ 91).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the analysis techniques taught by Pisello when analyzing the impact of proposed changes disclosed by Ann. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of a more accurate indication of the impact that a change will have on an enterprise.

Ann does not explicitly disclose using one or more external process modeling tools to determine a performance associated with the enterprise architecture, wherein the one or more external process modeling tools are configured to capture one or more process measurements and link the one or more process measurements to a database.

Patankar discloses determining a performance associated with the enterprise architecture by capturing one or more process measurements (see page 23, “Performance monitoring and prediction”, disclosing measuring organizational performance associated with the EIM framework). Patankar also suggests linking the measurements to a database (see id., disclosing organizational learning using prescriptive models for performance measurement; see also page

31, "EIM framework functional requirements", "Permanence", disclosing storing models in databases; Examiner also notes that the use of databases is well known in the art). While Patankar does not explicitly disclose that the performance measurements are performed by an external tool, this limitation is merely a recitation of intended use. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a functional difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Here, it does not matter what type of tool gathers the performance measurements (i.e. whether the tool is internal or external). The architecture of Patankar is capable of analyzing performance measures no matter how they are gathered.

Patankar and Ann are both related to frameworks for modeling a business. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine aspects of Patankar's architecture with aspects of Ann's architecture. This combination of known elements retains the functionality of the separate elements and produces a result that would be predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to add the performance measurements of Patankar to the architecture of Ann for the benefit of efficiencies gained by tracking performance and using results to make better decisions.

Claim 2: Ann discloses mapping the at least one customer requirement to the at least one capability (see figure 5, items 302 and 304; ¶ 41).

Ann does not explicitly disclose comparing the value provided by the at least one capability with another value provided by at least one other capability and determining which capability provides optimum value.

However, Ann does disclose comparing proposed changes to the enterprise (see paragraph 47).

Pisello teaches comparing values of capabilities to determine the best implementation (see ¶ 91, disclosing comparing IT projects based on their values).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the comparison techniques taught by Pisello when comparing the proposed changes disclosed by Ann. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of a more accurate determination of the best possible implementation.

Claim 3: Ann discloses wherein the identifying step includes identifying one or more strategic resources to support the at least one capability (see figure 5, items 316, 314, and 312; ¶¶ 13, 33, and 41-43).

Claim 4: Ann discloses wherein the identifying at least one capability step includes identifying at least one of a business process (see figure 5, item 316), a personnel skill/competency (see figure 5, item 314; ¶ 33), a physical entity (see figure 5, item 320), an information technology (see figure 5, item 342), a system component (see figure 5, item 330), and an infrastructure component (see figure 5, item 340).

Claim 5: Ann does not explicitly disclose assigning a weight to the one or more strategic resources and prioritizing the one or more strategic resources based on the assigned weight.

Pisello teaches this limitation (see ¶ 34, disclosing assigning costs to resources for a project, which weigh into and prioritize the project that is eventually chosen; ¶¶ 36 and 40; ¶ 41, disclosing key performance indicators which constitutes a measure of IT improvement). Furthermore, it is old and well-known in the art to prioritize items.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the weighting techniques taught by Pisello when analyzing change impact as disclosed by Ann. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of a more accurate representation of the impact associated with enterprise changes.

Claim 6: Ann does not explicitly disclose assigning outcome based performance metrics to the one or more strategic resources.

Pisello discloses this limitation (see ¶¶ 41-47, disclosing KPIs related to proposed IT projects).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the metrics taught by Pisello when analyzing the impact of changes as disclosed by Ann. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of a more efficient and accurate way to measure the impact of changes.

Claim 7: Ann discloses implementing the one or more strategic resources (see ¶ 47).

The combination of Ann and Pisello does not explicitly disclose tracking the one or more strategic resources based on the outcome based performance metrics. However, Pisello does teach using KPI to measure performance (see ¶ 41).

Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well-known in the business management arts at the time the invention was made to track performance, for example using KPI.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate well-known business management techniques into the method disclosed by Ann in order to track performance of implemented projects. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of accurately and efficiently determining the impact of implemented projects.

Claim 8: Ann does not explicitly disclose assigning a weight to the at least one capability; and prioritizing the at least one capability based on the assigned weight.

Pisello teaches this limitation (see ¶ 34, disclosing assigning costs to resources for a project, which weigh into and prioritize the project that is eventually chosen; ¶¶ 36 and 40; ¶ 41, disclosing key performance indicators which constitutes a measure of IT improvement). Furthermore, it is old and well-known in the art to prioritize items.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the weighting techniques taught by Pisello when analyzing change impact as disclosed by Ann. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of a more accurate representation of the impact associated with enterprise changes.

Claim 10: Ann discloses implementing the at least one capability (see ¶ 47).

Ann does not explicitly disclose assigning outcome based performance metrics to the at least one capability.

Pisello discloses this limitation (see ¶¶ 41-47, disclosing KPIs related to proposed IT projects).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the metrics taught by Pisello when analyzing the impact of changes as disclosed by Ann. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of a more efficient and accurate way to measure the impact of changes.

The combination of Ann and Pisello does not explicitly disclose tracking the at least one capability based on the outcome based performance metrics. However, Pisello does teach using KPI to measure performance (see ¶ 41).

Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well-known in the business management arts at the time the invention was made to track performance, for example using KPI.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate well-known business management techniques into the method disclosed by Ann in order to track performance of implemented projects. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of accurately and efficiently determining the impact of implemented projects.

Claims 32-41: Claims 32-41 describe a system for carrying out the method steps recited in claims 1-10, rejected above. Ann, Pisello, and Patankar disclose such a system (e.g. a computer); thus, claims 32-41 are rejected under similar rationale as claims 1-10, rejected above.

Claim 52: Claim 52 describes a computer program product for carrying out the method steps recited in claim 1, rejected above. Ann, Pisello, and Patankar disclose such a computer program product (e.g. a computer); thus, claim 52 is rejected under similar rationale as claim 1, rejected above.

Claim 53: Ann discloses wherein the at least one customer requirement is defined in response to a request by a customer (see e.g. ¶ 9, 47).

Claim 54: Ann does not explicitly disclose wherein the value is monetary or in terms of strategic business worth.

Pisello teaches wherein the value is monetary (see ¶ 33, disclosing determining IT project costs; ¶¶ 39 and 43, disclosing cost savings; ¶ 40, disclosing a cost-benefit template; ¶¶ 51-56 disclosing cost-benefit indices for the projects; ¶ 91).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the analysis techniques taught by Pisello when analyzing the impact of proposed changes disclosed by Ann. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of a more accurate indication of the impact that a change will have on an enterprise.

Claim 55: Ann does not explicitly disclose wherein the outcome based performance metrics are defined and tested by conducting facilitates working sessions or building simulation models.

Pisello predicting the expected values of KPIs due to project implementation (see ¶ 41).

Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well-known in the arts at the time the invention was made to perform simulations in order to forecast a value, for example a KPI.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform old and well-known simulations in order to determine the expected KPI values of Pisello when analyzing the impact of changes as disclosed by Ann. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of a more efficient and accurate way to measure the impact of changes.

Claim 56: Ann does not explicitly disclose wherein the estimates are at least one of entered, recorded, or modified as additional real performance information is observed.

Pisello discloses this limitation (see ¶¶ 33, 39, and 43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the estimates taught by Pisello when analyzing the impact of proposed changes disclosed by Ann. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of a more accurate indication of the impact that a change will have on an enterprise.

Claim 57: Ann discloses allowing at least one organizational executive to track functionality (see ¶ 39, disclosing tracking changes in the system). The cited references do not explicitly disclose flagging one or more of the at least one capability. However, the references suggest tracking and monitoring performance (see at least Patankar, page 23). Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well-known in the art at the time the invention was made to flag areas of concern while tracking and monitoring performance. Thus, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to flag certain capabilities while tracking and monitoring performance as disclosed by the cited references. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so for the benefit of efficiencies gained by closely monitoring areas of concern.

Claim 58: Ann does not explicitly disclose using the assigned weight to make a decision based on one or more of the implementation cost, the revenue increase, and the cost saving.

Pisello teaches this limitation (see ¶ 34, disclosing assigning costs to resources for a project, which weigh into and prioritize the project that is eventually chosen; ¶¶ 36 and 40; ¶ 41, disclosing key performance indicators which constitutes a measure of IT improvement). Furthermore, Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well-known in the art at the time the invention was made to prioritize items and make decisions based on those priorities. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the weighting techniques to make decisions as taught by Pisello when analyzing change impact as disclosed by Ann. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so

for the benefit of a more accurate representation of the impact associated with enterprise changes.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Buchanan, Richard D. and Richard Mark Soley. "Aligning Enterprise Architecture and IT Investments with Corporate Goals." OMG Whitepaper (2002)
- Rood, Melody A. "Enterprise Architecture: Definition, Content, and Utility." IEEE (1994)
- Boster, Mark, et al. "Getting the Most from Your Enterprise Architecture." IT Pro (2000)
- Chalmeta, Ricardo, et al. "References Architectures for Enterprise Integration." *The Journal of Systems and Software*: Volume 57 (2001). pp 175-191
- Malhotra, Yogesh. "Enterprise Architecture: An Overview." BRINST Institute (1996)
- Armour, Frank J., et al. "Building an Enterprise Architecture Step by Step." *IT Pro* (1999)
- Armour, Frank J., et al. "A Big-Picture Look at Enterprise Architectures." *IT Pro* (1999)

- Kosanke, K., et al. "CIMOSA: Enterprise Engineering and Integration."
Computers in Industry: Volume 40 (1999). pp 83-97
- Beznosov, Konstantin. "Information Enterprise Architectures: Problems and Perspectives." *Florida International University School of Computer Science Technical Report* (2000)
- Zachman, John A. "Enterprise Architecture: The Issue of the Century." Zachman International (1996)

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neil R. Kardos whose telephone number is (571) 270-3443. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Neil R. Kardos
Examiner
Art Unit 3623

NRK
11/22/08
/Jonathan G. Sterrett/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623